

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 22, 2007 the Examiner noted that claims 1-21 were pending, and rejected claims 1-21. Claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 16, and 21 have been amended, and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-21 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Request for Withdrawal of Finality

As discussed below, the rejection of claims 4, 9, 13 and 19 is critically deficient, improper and withdrawal of the rejection thereof is requested. It is also requested that the finality of the Action also be withdrawn as based on a critically defective rejection.

Art Rejections

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-12, 14-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Dell and Henson patents '383 and '815.

Page 16 of the Office Action rejects claims 4, 9, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Dell, Henson '383 and Rosen. The Examiner is requested to clarify this rejection as these claims depend from the above discussed claims where the two Henson patents are used. It appears that since Henson '815 is critical to rejecting the parent claims this rejection is critically defective. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested. It is further requested that the finality of the Action be withdrawn as improper.

In making the rejection, the Examiner has admitted that Dell, and Henson '383 do not disclose "where all the specific interior parts are displayed with corresponding delivery dates" of the claims (see page 5 of the Action). The Examiner asserts that Henson '815 teaches this feature. In making this assertion, the Examiner points to Henson '815 at col. 2, lines 13-15, figure 4 and col. 8, lines 25-55.

These portions of Henson '815 only discuss displaying a delivery date for the entire selected system, see figure 3 where all parts have the same delivery date and the delivery date of the system is the delivery date of the item dictating the shipping date. And these portions discuss displaying, see figure 4, the selection dictating delivery date of the entire system and showing potential lead time improvements of items that can be substituted for the item that is critical to the delivery date.

The Examiner is interpreting the delivery date for the system set by the selection that dictates the delivery date as a whole to be a delivery date for each of the parts. In the example

of figures 3 and 4, as noted above, the CPU would have a delivery date of 17 July, the Monitor would have a delivery date of 17 July and the Memory would have a delivery date of 17 July. However, each of the parts does not have an individual part delivery date.

In contrast, in the present invention of claim 1, each of the individual parts of the invention has an individual delivery date that is shown or displayed ("where all the specific interior parts are displayed with corresponding **one-to-one individual** delivery dates" - claim 1 **bold** emphasis added).

It is submitted that Dell and the Henson patents do not teach or suggest such.

Claims 6, 10, 14, 16 and 21 emphasize a similar feature

It is submitted that the independent claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 23, 2007

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501